UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/586,204 | 09/29/2006 | Wei-Ping Chen | WPTHOM9.002APC | 4772 | |
| | 7590 04/15/201 , LIND & PONACK, I | EXAMINER | | | |
| 1030 15th Stree Suite 400 East | | KOSACK, JOSEPH R | | | |
| Washington, DC 20005-1503 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1626 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| | | | 04/15/2010 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com eoa@wenderoth.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/586,204 | CHEN ET AL. | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | Joseph R. Kosack | 1626 | |
|--|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>29 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (1) the period for the pox (b) the period for reply expired to the period for the pe | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | n. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(: Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 cension and the corresponding amount of the chartened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal was filed on | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| | out prior to the data of filing a brief | will not be entered be | 201122 |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | cause |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially red | ducing or simplifying th | ne issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | timely filed amendmer | it canceling the |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [| ☐ will not be entered, or b\ ☐ will | I ha antarad and an a | volanation of |
| how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | i be entered and an ex | CPIANALION OF |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | t b - f - n - n - n - t b - d - t f - f ilin n - N | tion of Ammont will make | h |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowand | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (| (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | /Joseph R Kosack/ Examiner, Art Unit 1626 | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Berlin et al. do not teach that the Grignard reaction would never be preferred. To the contrary, Berlin et al. teach that "Nucleophilic displacements on phosphonic halides by Grignard reagents are well documented, but apparantly coupling of the Grignard reagent 3 is a serious side reaction since 1,2-di-(1-naphthyl)-ethane could be isolated from the mixture" See page 78. Therefore, even though a particular Grignard reagent may have problems with a coupling side reaction, this would not be the case with every Grignard reagent. Therefore, Berlin et al. do not teach away from the Grignard reaction, nor does Berlin et al. teach that the Grignard reaction is inferior in each and every case. Therefore, the Examiner must maintain the rejections at the present time.